



## **Migrant Transfers and Local Development**

25 September 2009

**Dr. Priya Deshingkar**

**Funded by the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and  
Development/GTZ Sectoral Project Rural Territorial Development**

---

\* Disclaimer: The views presented in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of GTZ

**Overseas Development Institute**  
111 Westminster Bridge Road  
London SE1 7JD  
UK

Tel: +44 (0)20 7922 0300 Fax: +44 (0)20 7922 0399  
[www.odi.org.uk](http://www.odi.org.uk)

## Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Part 1. Rural-Urban Migration Trends and Numbers</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Part 2. Characteristics of migrant transfers</b> .....	<b>4</b>
2.1 Remittances.....	4
2.2 Factors that affect the likelihood of out-migrants remitting to their household of origin and the magnitude of the remittances.....	5
<b>Part 3. Impacts of migrant Transfers</b> .....	<b>5</b>
3.1 Impacts of remittances at the household level .....	6
Box 1 Social Spending Of Migration Earnings .....	7
3.2 Remittances and Inequality .....	8
3.3 The Impacts of Remittances on the Local Economy and Society .....	9
3.4 Impact of social remittances .....	9
3.5 Potentially negative impacts of migrant transfers .....	10
3.6 Overall impacts on poverty and development .....	10
3.7 Effects of the economic crisis and long term prospects for migrant transfers .....	11
3.8 Policy and Institutional factors that reduce the potentially positive impacts of transfers ..	11
3.9 Lessons from urban development programmes .....	11
3.10 Migrant support initiatives in India .....	12
<b>References</b> .....	<b>12</b>

## Introduction

Migrant transfers include cash remittances, social remittances and transfers in kind. Although rural-urban migrants send smaller amounts of money and carry back lower-end knowledge and skills, there is clear evidence that such transfers are changing rural economies for the better across the globe. However there is little recognition at the policy level. A lack of data and political commitment have led to continuing ignorance about the potentially positive impacts of migrant transfers. Lessons can be learned from urban development programmes in China and migrant support programmes in India and these are briefly reviewed in the paper to stimulate discussion on policy reform.

The paper is divided into three parts. The first part contains a brief overview of rural-urban migration based on recent field evidence. The second part of the paper addresses the central question of the impacts of migrant transfers on local development. Different kinds of transfers are discussed including cash remittances, remittances in kind, social remittances as well as the transfer of knowledge, technology and labour market information. The paper concludes with a few examples of interventions in the areas of urban development and remittance services that offer lessons for policy.

### Part 1. Rural-Urban Migration Trends and Numbers

Internal migration involves larger numbers of people than international migration. For example in 2006, there were roughly 61 million South-South migrants (i.e. from one southern country to another). In contrast, the numbers for China for the same period were at least 120 million.

Rural-urban (RU) migration which involves the movement of people from villages to towns and cities is one type of internal migration, others being rural-rural migration, urban-rural migration and urban-urban migration. Governments and policy makers have traditionally been reluctant to allow rural-urban migration because they want to limit urban growth. However attempts to keep migrants out have usually been futile. This antipathy towards migrants means that RU migration is never properly planned for and new entrants are forced to live in shanty towns and slums. Many of these migrants work in relatively poorly paid jobs (i.e. compared to the formal sector) and long experience in Latin America and Asia has shown that most do not transition to the formal economy.

The many barriers to settling in urban areas have led to an increase in circular and seasonal<sup>1</sup> types of RU migration. There is now compelling evidence which shows that until recently, circular RU migration was on the rise across Asia (even if rural-rural continued to account for the bulk of migratory movements). China has anywhere between 120 million and 200 million circular migrants (Ping 2003, Zhao 2003) who are unregistered and often referred to as the “floating population”. These migrants outnumber registered migrants by approximately 4 to 1 (Guest 2003). Studies in Vietnam have shown that migrants preferred long-term leave permits rather than registering as permanent migrants at the destination. This allows their families to continue to cultivate their land on their behalf (IIED 2004). Indonesia has also witnessed an increase in circular or temporary

---

<sup>1</sup> A working definition of internal circular migration is when the person does not intend to settle at the destination and

migration. A longitudinal study of 37 villages in Java carried out over the period 1967-91 (Collier et al. 1993) concluded that most of the landless rural families in Java have at least one person working outside of the village in a factory or service job. Data for Bangladesh generated by the United Nations, the ILO and the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics showed that RU migration accounted for nearly two-thirds of outmigration from rural areas (Afsar 2003)<sup>2</sup>.

At the same time permanent RU migration was on the decline because of the barriers to settling down in urban areas (Kundu 2003, Hugo 2003). These vary by country but have similar outcomes in that they do not allow poor people from villages easy access to housing and government schemes. China has an elaborate *Hukou* system that does not allow people from the countryside to settle in urban areas; Vietnam's **KT**<sup>3</sup> system has similar effects (Anh 2003). In India the welfare system is such that access to subsidised food, healthcare and many other schemes aimed at the population below the poverty line is possible only in the normal place of residence i.e. the village.

The economic crisis has had an adverse impact on RU migration particularly in sectors linked to international markets such as the diamond polishing industry in India (personal communication Pramod Sharma) and export oriented industry in Vietnam (personal communication Dang Nguyen Anh). Many migrants have lost their jobs and many have returned to their villages. Judging from past trends after economic crises in Southeast Asia, it is likely that RU migration rates will pick up rapidly when the economy recovers.

## Part 2. Characteristics of migrant transfers

A review of the literature indicates that migrant transfers are broadly of three types:

1. Cash remittances – these can be sent through formal or informal channels (such as hawala systems or through friends and relatives). The poorest migrants tend to hand-carry their savings when they visit their families.
2. Social remittances – these are ideas, practices, identities and social capital that flow from migrants to sending families and communities through direct interactions or other forms of communication. Social remittances are a neglected component of migrant transfers and while some studies have been conducted on international social remittances, the information on internal social remittances is scarce. Social remittances may affect family relations, gender roles, class and race identity, as well as political, economic and religious participation.
3. In Kind transfers – besides cash, migrants may also send or carry goods including clothes, jewellery and consumer durables.

### 2.1 Remittances

Although much has been written on the level and effects of international remittances, relatively little is known about internal remittances. There are no global estimates on the size of total internal

---

<sup>2</sup> On the basis of panel data generated from 62 randomly sampled villages in Bangladesh (Rahman et al. 1996).

<sup>3</sup> The KT system is a system whereby a person is registered as resident of a particular rural or urban area. There are four types of KT registrations (KT1,KT2...) with KT1 being the equivalent of permanent resident with full rights and KT4 being a temporary resident with few or no rights to government services.

remittances. Generating robust data on internal remittances is hard because a majority of poor migrants do not use formal channels for sending money. A study in Ghana by Adams (2007) found that 99 percent of internal migrants remit through informal channels (friends, relatives). Where data have been available, the quantum of remittances can be computed and these give us some indication of the flows involved:

- China: it is estimated each migrant labourer sent home on average 4,522 yuan (US\$545) in the year 2000 (Murphy 2005). According to the Consultative Group to Assist the Poor, China's rural migrants sent nearly US\$ 30 billion back home to their families in 2005.
- The average amount of remittances was much lower in Vietnam: According to the Government's 2004 Migration Survey which covered nearly 5,000 migrant households across 11 cities and provinces, more than half had sent money to their households of origin. Over two-thirds had sent over one million Dong (c.US\$65) within the previous year.
- India: In Mumbai, data collected from the Post Office indicates that migrant money orders account for much of the £million plus sent back to Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and West Bengal, some of the poorest states in the country (Deshingkar et al 2006).

## **2.2 Factors that affect the likelihood of out-migrants remitting to their household of origin and the magnitude of the remittances.**

The Theory of New Economics of Migration postulates that sending remittances is an implicit contractual arrangement between migrants and household members staying behind. Migration is a diversification strategy where household resources including family labour are allocated to reduce risk (Stark 1982; Stark and Bloom 1985; Stark and Lucas 1988).

Where migration is a survival or coping strategy, migrants are more likely to send money home if their families need money. In other words the likelihood of migrants remitting money is determined not just by their individual characteristics, but also by the characteristics of their household of origin. Furthermore, remittances may form a significant portion of the household income for poor families receiving the money. But this is not the case everywhere and there are non-economic reasons for sending remittances. In Thailand sending money to families in the village is a cultural norm rooted in altruism rather than the economic needs of the household (Osaki 2003).

There is some research showing that international migrants are more likely to remit. Studies in Mali by Gubert (2002) and Ghana by Adams (2007) found that international migrants are more likely to remit, and to remit more money, than internal migrants. This is probably due to the fact that international migrants earn more.

## **Part 3. Impacts of migrant Transfers**

It helps to state at the outset that the nature of transfers from rural urban migrants is fundamentally different to transfers from international migrants in terms of the amount/quantities sent as well as the nature of the households that benefit. On the whole, rural urban migrants belong to a lower socio-economic stratum than international migrants; they tend to be less educated and less skilled and consequently earn less at the destination. They are able to remit smaller amounts. The Ghana living standards survey found that while the average value of internal remittances received

by households is only about 30 percent of the value of international remittances, about 5 times as many households receive internal as opposed to international remittances (Adams, 2007). RU remittances go mainly to *rural* households while international remittances go mainly to urban households. The impacts of remittances happen in two ways: at the household level and at the community/economy level.

### **3.1 Impacts of remittances at the household level**

The impact of remittances depends very much on the assets and capabilities of the migrant and the household to which they belong, as well as the vulnerability context in the sending area i.e. whether or not there is a drought, levels of agricultural development and of employment. A migrant belonging to a poor household with little or no education who is leaving the village because of drought is likely to accept work as a manual labourer. His or her capacity to save and remit will be lower than a migrant belonging to a wealthier family. The family left behind may be in such a situation that repaying debt and spending on basic food is all that is managed with little reduction in poverty levels. Nevertheless survival and coping are important outcomes and maintaining standards of living has been a crucial outcome of migration in poor regions. Qualitative data collected by Shah and Sah (2004) from 212 households in a village in Bhadwani district in Southern Madhya Pradesh shows that migration helped landless households to maintain their standard of living over a decade. The researchers assessed the change in well-being rank over ten years and found that 180 households had retained their original well-being status (including those that were already poor), 7% experienced an improvement, and the remaining 38% deteriorated in status. The analysis suggested that (a) improvement was generally associated with access to irrigation through private sources or obtaining a salaried job; (b) deterioration was largely due to division of landholdings and, at times, due to indebtedness and (c) some households, especially the landless, could retain their well-being status in the better-off or medium categories due to migration.

On the other hand those who are better educated and better connected find better jobs and can remit more money. In such a case remittances can result in rapid accumulation of assets and a faster escape from poverty.

In general households with migrants benefit from the flow of remittances in the following ways:

#### ***Increased household income and smoothing risk***

The Coalition for the Urban Poor estimates that circular migrants in Dhaka, Bangladesh send up to 60 per cent of their income home. This provides up to 80 per cent of the budget for recipient households. Research in the poor tribal areas of southern Madhya Pradesh in India found that migration earnings were an important source of income: Narain et al (2005) studied 550 households in 60 villages in Jhabua district in 2000/1 it was seen that households in the three poorest quartiles earned 65-70% of their total wage income from seasonal migration. In contrast, households in the top quartile earned the largest share of total labour income (63%) from regular jobs in the private or public sector and only about 30% from off-village labour.

#### ***Improved consumption***

Case studies across the world show that consumption continues to be the major use of remittances. Although consumption was once thought to be wasteful expenditure, there is now agreement that spending on food can have a significant impact on improving human capital through better nutrition (HDR 2009) and this can lead to long term improvements in income and well being. Spending on house construction and improvement which is another common use of remittances can create jobs for local people and stimulate the local construction industry (Skeldon 1990, 1997). Finally social expenditure such as spending on wedding parties and religious ceremonies can also have positive feedback on the local economy by creating work for

local service providers, agricultural producers and traders. They can also play a role in preserving and promoting culture and tradition.

### **Repaying debt**

This emerges as an important use of remittances especially in locations where rural indebtedness to local moneylenders has been a long-standing problem. In studies conducted by the Overseas Development Institute in the Indian states of Andhra Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh since 2001 (Deshingkar and Farrington 2009) remittances had helped poor castes and tribes to release themselves from debt bondage. The inflow of cash adds to the family status as it reduces the need to borrow money in times of need. However some have remained in debt because there has been an increase in borrowing and spending for social purposes (see Box 1 below).

#### Box 1 Social Spending Of Migration Earnings

In Jhabua district in addition to financing essential needs when household food supplies run out five to six months after the harvest, migration money is financing two important social customs known as '*Notra*' and '*Bhagoriya*'. This district has a large population of Bhil and Bhilala tribals where the average landholding is about one acre per household and the average household size is five to six persons. *Notra* refers to a system of community contribution among the Bhils. A household in need borrows from another in cash or kind. The borrowing is marked by a feast for family, neighbours and friends. Repayments are made with "interest" i.e. the amount or quantity returned is greater than that borrowed. Records of contributions received are meticulously maintained. Receiving *notra* from a family and not repaying them during the *notra* organised by them constitutes a serious violation of village rules. The Panchayat is called in to decide on the punishment to be meted out to the erring family. The expenses of the feast and repayments require heavy spending and it has been mentioned that migration money is the reason for this escalation. Spending lavishly during the *notra* ceremony raises the social status of the family and much importance is placed on this custom in Bhil society. *Bhagoriya* is another custom wherein boys choose a girl to marry and pay a bride price to the girl's family. The young couple then migrate to repay moneylenders or relatives from whom the money was borrowed.

### **Investing in agriculture and non-farm enterprise**

Those who have entrepreneurial or farming skills as well as the required technical support and market linkages are able to invest in agriculture and non-farm enterprise. Focus group discussions in Muzzafarpur, Gaya and Madhubani districts of Bihar show that those castes that were traditionally engaged in agriculture tend to lease in land or improve their farm whereas Muslims who were traditionally traders have used remittance money to set up small businesses near their villages (Deshingkar et al 2006).

### **Investing in health and education**

Positive impacts on health and education have been documented in diverse contexts across the globe. Quisumbing and McNivven (2007) analyse a longitudinal data set from the Philippines showing that remittances have a positive impact on education. The Bukidnon Panel Study follows up 448 families in rural Mindanao who were first interviewed in 1984/85 by the International Food Policy Research Institute and the Research Institute for Mindanao Culture, Xavier University. The study interviewed the original respondents and a sample of their

offspring, both those who have remained in the same area and those who have moved to a different location. Mueller and Shariff analyse human development data for India for the year 2004-5 to examine correlations between the receipt of remittances from internal migrants and human capital investment in rural areas. We employ a propensity score–matching approach to account for the selectivity of households into receiving remittances. They interpret results conservatively due to the cross-sectional nature of the data but still find a positive correlation between remittances received from internal migrants and the schooling attendance of teens. The magnitude of the correlation is greater when focusing on low-caste households, and male schooling attendance in particular becomes more positive and statistically significant. In another study from India, 310 poor families of industrial workers in Mumbai migrating from Jaunpur district in Uttar Pradesh were interviewed to assess the impact of migration and remittances on household wellbeing. 86% of the women interviewed reported better access to schooling for their children, 84% reported an improvement in food intake and 51% reported better access to healthcare (UNDP-TAHA 2007).

### ***Enabling families members to withdraw from underpaid and degrading work***

Remittances may release household members left behind from the need to engage in degrading and underpaid work, they may also reduce the incidence of child labour. Analysis of the World Bank Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS) data on the Kagera region in Tanzania by Dimova et al (2008) shows that both migration and remittances decrease the supply of child labour by the household. The data consists of a panel of nearly 800 rural households for 1991, 1992, 1993 and 1994 and approximately 2500 in 2004, where some of the households can be traced back to the 1991-1994 panel.

## **3.2 Remittances and Inequality**

Not everyone in a rural area benefits equally from the flow of remittances. There is a threshold of asset levels (human, financial, social) below which migration cannot occur. In other words only those who have the physical strength and health as well as some money and social contacts are able to migrate for the lowest paid jobs such as manual work. Better jobs require a higher level of assets. Migration thus excludes the very poorest such as those without land or labour (sick, old, disabled). Early research on remittances and migration by influential economists asserted that rural-urban migration does not tend to equalize incomes either between or within regions. Lipton (1980) identifies the following reasons<sup>4</sup>:

- a) The selective nature of migration, providing higher returns to the better off and better educated, prevents equalization within areas of origin;
- b) There are costs and barriers associated with migration, including access to information about opportunities, which tend to steer the gains of migration towards the rich;
- c) The absence of the most productive household members leads to a lowering of labour-intensity, which, according to Lipton, is “socially maladaptive, especially in the medium run, while the rural work force is growing much faster than other, scarcer factors of production”;
- d) The volume of net remittances is usually low; and
- c) Return migrants are likely to be the old, sick and unsuccessful, and skills brought back are unlikely to be of much help.

---

<sup>4</sup> Taken from de Haan 1999.



However, we argue below that this kind of approach overlooks the fact that increased consumption and investment by remittance receiving households can stimulate the local economy and lead to increased incomes for other people in the sending area as well.

### **3.3 The Impacts of Remittances on the Local Economy and Society**

As noted above, increased consumption by remittance receiving households can stimulate parts of the local economy. There are four major pathways through which this can occur:

#### ***By stimulating the land market***

Migrant remittances can be used to buy or lease land which has a knock-on effect on the local economy. On the basis of research in Bangladesh, Afsar (2003) argues that remittances have invigorated the land tenancy market in rural areas: the proportion of tenant farmers increased from 42 per cent to 57 per cent between 1988 and 2000, and the land under tenancy cultivation increased to 33 per cent, an 11 per cent rise from 1988.

#### ***By providing employment to local labourers and service providers***

Two studies in Thailand by Guest (1998) show that remittances are an important supplement to household income and have a multiplier effect on the economy with many major items of expenditure, such as construction materials and labour, procured locally. Anh (2003) draws similar conclusions based on data from Bangladesh, China, Vietnam and the Philippines. Anh identifies migration as a driver of growth and an important route out of poverty with significant positive impacts on people's livelihoods and wellbeing and concludes that attempts to control mobility will be counterproductive.

#### ***By stimulating the demand for locally produced goods***

With more money in the household budget, the families of migrants can spend on buying consumer goods and essentials which stimulate the local economy. An ILO study of rural urban migration in Indonesia found remittances increased individual household incomes and stimulated demand, creating local markets and jobs for non-migrants.

#### ***By increasing the income of people beyond the immediate household***

These recipients may stimulate the economy through mechanisms 1-3. Adams (2007) found that many migrants in Ghana remit to households other than their nuclear households; that is, they remit to relatives and friends.

### **3.4 Impact of social remittances**

Ideas and knowledge communicated by migrants or brought back to the village in person when they return in between trips can have a deep impact on societies that have been isolated from the outside world. Social remittances can promote new agricultural techniques, entrepreneurial activities and new attitudes towards gender roles, contraception and education that may lead to positive impacts on wellbeing. But here too the skills, knowledge and attitudes that are brought back depend on the initial endowments and capabilities of the sending household as well as the overall vulnerability context. Thus a migrant from a poor family with little education who ends up in a poorly paid job with few prospects for learning new skills will be able to transfer some basic skills. On the other hand a wealthier and better qualified person would be able to access a better job that could give them the skills that could be used to set up a business when they come back to the village.

### 3.5 Potentially negative impacts of migrant transfers

There are negative impacts of migrant transfers as well such as creating dependency and the disincentive for work. Additional flows of money in households that lack entrepreneurial skills or technical and marketing support could lead to wasteful expenditure on conspicuous consumption.

### 3.6 Overall impacts on poverty and development

In general, recent studies from Asia show greater positive impacts because of the boom in manufacturing and urbanisation preceding the recent economic crisis. In contrast, studies from Africa present a more mixed picture as urban wages have not risen to the same extent. For example, there is widespread agreement now that RU labour migration on an unprecedented scale played a vital role in achieving poverty reduction and economic development in sending villages in China. Rural poverty in China dropped dramatically from 30.7 per cent in 1978 to 2.6 per cent in 2005. Some studies have actually made the link: a panel of household data from 88 villages across eight provinces in China collected by the Research Center for the Rural Economy (RCRE) at China's Ministry of Agriculture, supplemented by a follow-up survey conducted by World Bank researchers and RCRE in 2004 show that poorer households experienced both higher consumption growth and more rapid income growth (de Brauw and Giles 2008). The average income per capita of poorer households rose as they supplied more labour to productive activities, and acquired more land for agricultural production, suggesting that migration from rural communities reduced inequality within China's villages. Migration also facilitated the accumulation of housing wealth, consumer durables, and investments related to agricultural production. However, there was little investment in non-agricultural enterprise. A potentially negative impact of migration was that there was a drop in secondary school enrolment: a one percent increase in the size of the migrant labour force is associated with a fall of 0.18 to 0.23 percent in the probability that a middle school graduate will continue on to high school.

Recognition of the potentially positive impacts of migration on poverty reduction and local development has been slower to come in India, a country where nearly a third of the world's poor live. The underlying reason is a strong anti-migration policy position that is reinforced by researchers from a structuralist tradition who emphasise the negative impacts of migration. However recent research by some scholars shows that migration has reduced poverty levels. For example Deshingkar and Akter (2009) analysing panel data between 2001/2 and 2006/7 note that migration led to a fall from 45% to 29% in the proportion of households with migrants who were poor in Andhra Pradesh and a corresponding reduction in poverty from 81% to 41% in Madhya Pradesh; Deshingkar and Farrington (2009) synthesise fresh evidence from several Indian states which clearly shows that RU migration is helping to sustain and enhance living standards of poor people belonging to villages in semi-arid and forested areas. Adding up the numbers of circular migrants in various sectors including the textile industry, construction, mining and quarrying, hotels and restaurants, domestic work, street hawking and transport indicates that there were close to 100 million circular migrants in India before the economic crisis. What is missing in the Indian context is the kind of analysis that was done for China, namely establishing a link between the fall in rural poverty with RU migration. Although nearly 42% of the Indian population lives in poverty according to the World Bank (and 27% according to the Indian Planning Commission), poverty rates have decreased markedly from 60% in 1981<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> The World Bank estimates that 456 million Indians or 42% of the total Indian population lived under the global poverty line of \$1.25 per day (PPP) in 2005, down from 60 percent in 1981. Income inequality (Gini coefficient: 32.5 in year 1999- 2000) is increasing. On the other hand, the Planning Commission of India uses its own criteria and estimates that 27.5% of the population was living below the poverty line in 2004–2005, down from 51.3% in 1977–1978, and 36% in 1993-1994. The source for this was the 61st round of the National Sample Survey (NSS) and the criterion used was monthly per capita consumption expenditure below Rs. 356.35 for rural areas and Rs. 538.60 for urban areas. 75% of the poor are in rural areas, most of them are daily wagers, self-employed householders and landless labourers.

### **3.7 Effects of the economic crisis and long term prospects for migrant transfers**

The economic crisis affected export-oriented industries such as diamond polishing and textiles in India and garment manufacture in Vietnam. There is plenty of anecdotal evidence that this has led to large scale job losses and a drop in remittances. However, past experience of the Southeast Asian economic crisis suggests that rural migration rates picked up rapidly when economies started to recover and it is very likely that this will occur as the present crisis recedes.

### **3.8 Policy and Institutional factors that reduce the potentially positive impacts of transfers**

There are barriers to mobility in a number of countries ranging from more formal mechanisms in China and Vietnam to other kinds of barriers in African and South Asian countries. In general, governments have been reluctant to grant rights and entitlements to poor people coming into cities from rural areas. Urban development programmes aim to keep migrants out and rarely provide housing and infrastructure to rural-urban migrants. The additional costs and risks imposed on migrants by a negative policy environment mean that migrants can save less and remit less.

Sending small amounts of money is difficult through formal banking channels and migrants tend to send money with friends and relatives or carry it on their person. The risk of theft by criminals as well as extortion by the police is extremely high in some locations such as Bihari migrants returning from Punjab who report a high level of extortion by the police on certain train routes that are known to be used by migrants (Deshingkar et al 2006).

Finally, the lack of agricultural extension and business development support in many locations means that remittances cannot be invested effectively.

### **3.9 Lessons from urban development programmes**

2004 was the year that saw the beginning of recognition at the government level of the role that rural-urban migration had played in poverty reduction in China. It was around this time that the Asian Development Bank completely changed its course on the technical assistance provided to the Government of China on urban poverty reduction. It revised its approach in the second phase of its **Technical Assistance** programme to include migrants (ADB 1999, 2005). It states that:

“The current ES system no longer meets ES needs, which have risen markedly with the rate of rural–urban migration [...] An improved ES system, when effectively implemented, will deliver significant benefits. For migrant workers, effective public ES will reduce the costs of migration, resulting in (i) less time and resources spent on moving and job seeking, (ii) improved opportunities to find better and stable jobs; (iii) improved working conditions and rights protection; and (iv) higher earnings garnered in the longer term, thus improving living standards. At the macro level, strengthened ES will (i) reduce overall transaction costs, (ii) improve the effectiveness of the labour markets, and (iii) enhance sustained economic growth. A better ES system will lead to more orderly and effective rural–urban migration, which in turn

will contribute to balanced development with less disparity between rural and urban areas and between more affluent coastal and less-developed central and western regions.”

A recent evaluation has shown that these objectives are now being met.<sup>6</sup>

Both Thailand and Lao PDR have followed a similarly accommodative approach in their recent urban development strategies which aim to foster rural urban links to reduce rural poverty. There is a need for further research on the applicability of these models to other contexts.

### **3.10 Migrant support initiatives in India**

In India civil society has partially filled the gap in providing support to migrants. Adhikar and Aajeevika Bureau are two well established NGOs who provide safe, cheap and fast remittance services for poor migrants. They have now started to work with larger banks to explore the possibility of up-scaling such services. Banks are interested in this potentially untapped market but progress is slow despite several pilot projects by the Indian Bank and ICICI Bank in different parts of the country. The reasons for this are not entirely clear and should be researched further to see how they can be supported and whether similar initiatives can be implemented in other parts of the world.

In sum, despite the many positive impacts of migrant transfers on sending areas, policies and programmes are lagging behind and there is an urgent need to reform policy and learn lessons from successful initiatives. Further research to identify best practice is needed and high level policy dialogue is required to generate political interest in the issue.

## **References**

ADB. 1999. Technical Assistance to the People's Republic of China for Urban Poverty Study. Manila

ADB. 2005. Technical Assistance to the People's Republic of China for Urban Poverty Strategy Study II. Manila

Anh D. N. (2003) Migration and poverty in Asia: with reference to Bangladesh, China, the Philippines and Viet Nam, Ad Hoc Expert Group Meeting on Migration and Development, organized by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, 27–29 August.

Afsar R. (2003) Dynamics of poverty, development and population mobility: the Bangladesh case, Ad Hoc Expert Group Meeting on Migration and Development, organized by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, 27–29 August.

---

<sup>6</sup> Employment Services for Rural Migrant Workers: China, People's Rep. of  
<http://pid.adb.org/pid/TaView.htm?projNo=40131&seqNo=01&typeCd=2>

Adams, Jr., Richard. (2007) An Overview of Data Contained in the 2005/06 Ghana Living Standards Survey (Glss 5) on Migration and Remittances. Washington, DC: Unpublished draft manuscript.

~~Adams, Jr., Richard, Alfredo Cuacuecha, and John Page (2008) Remittances, Consumption and Investment in Ghana, edited by W. Bank. Washington, DC: World Bank.~~

de Brauw, A. and J. Giles (2008) Rural to Urban Migration in China: How Do Migrant-Sending Communities Benefit? Research April 8, 2008,

Deshingkar, P and J. Farrington (2009) Circular Migration and Multilocational Livelihood Strategies in India. New Delhi: Oxford University Press

**Deshingkar and Akter (2009a)** Migration and Human Development in India. Human Development Research Paper 2009/13. United Nations Development Programme, New York.

Deshingkar, P. (2008) Circular Internal Migration and Development in India. In De Wind and Holdaway (eds.) Migration and Development Within and Across Borders. The Social Science Research Council, New York.

~~Deshingkar, P., P. Sharma, S. Kumar, S. Akter and J. Farrington (2008) Circular migration in Madhya Pradesh: Changing patterns and Social Protection Needs. The European Journal of Development Research Vol. 20, No. 4, December 2008, 612–628~~

~~Deshingkar, P. (2006) Internal Migration, Poverty and Development in Asia. IDS Bulletin Vol 37 No 3 pp 88-100.~~

Deshingkar, P., S. Kumar, H. Kumar Chobey and D. Kumar. (2006) The Role of Migration and Remittances in Promoting Livelihoods in Bihar. Bihar Rural Livelihoods Project (BRLP) India.

Dimova, R., G. Epstein and I. Gang (2008). Migration, Remittances, and Child Labor. Fifth IZA Annual Migration Meeting, Bonn. [http://www.iza.org/conference\\_files/AMM\\_2008/gang\\_i109.pdf](http://www.iza.org/conference_files/AMM_2008/gang_i109.pdf)

Guest P. (2003) Bridging the Gap: Internal Migration in Asia, Population Council Thailand, paper prepared for the Conference on African Migration in Comparative Perspective, Johannesburg, South Africa, 4–7 June.

**Guest P. (1998)** The Dynamics of Internal Migration in Vietnam, UNDP Discussion Paper 1, Hanoi, Vietnam.

Hugo, G. (2003) Urbanisation in Asia: an Overview, paper prepared for the Conference on African Migration in Comparative Perspective, Johannesburg, South Africa, 4–7.

Kundu, A. (2003) 'Urbanisation and Urban Governance, Search for a Perspective Beyond Neo-liberalism', Economic and Political Weekly, XXXVIII, No. 29, July 19, pp 3079–87.

Lipton, M. (1980) Migration from Rural Areas of Poor Countries: The Impact on Rural Productivity and Income Distribution, World Development 8, 227, pp.1-24.

Osaki, K. (2003) Migrant remittances in Thailand: economic necessity or social norm? Journal of Population Research, pp?

Ping, H. (2003) China migration country study, paper presented at the Regional Conference on Migration, Development and Pro-Poor Policy Choices in Asia, organized by the Bangladesh Refugee and Migratory Movements Research Unit, Bangladesh/DFID UK, Dhaka, 22–24 June.

Quisumbing, A. and S. McNiven (2007) Moving Forward, Looking Back: The Impact of Migration and Remittances on Assets, Consumption, and Credit Constraints in the Rural Philippines. ESA Working Paper No. 07-05. Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome.

~~Sheng, Y. (2002) Poverty Alleviation through Rural-Urban Linkages: Policy implications Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific Bangkok.~~

Skeldon, R. (1997) Rural-to-Urban Migration and Its Implications for Poverty Alleviation Vol. 12, No. 1, March 1997 available at <http://www.unescap.org/ESID/psis/population/journal/Articles/1997/V12N1A1.htm>

Skeldon, R. (1990) Population Mobility in Developing Countries: A Reinterpretation (London: Belhaven).

Zhao Z. (2003) Rural-urban migration in China – what do we know and what do we need to know? China Center for Economic Research, Beijing University.